

## REMARKS

Claims 1-6 are pending in this application. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. §112 second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. It is gratefully acknowledged that Claims 1-6 would be allowed, if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112. Original Claims 1, 5 and 6 are independent claims, and by the present amendment, Claims 2-4 are now independent claims as well.

Regarding the Examiner's rejection of Claim 1, the Examiner states that the term "multiplying M polyphase filters" is indefinite as it fails to clearly specify the quantities that are multiplied and that the "sampling frequency converter fails to be clearly related to the polyphase structure filter." Accordingly, Claim 1 has been amended to include the recitation "M polyphase filters for multiplying each of N coefficients by M signals determined by sampling signals for a period K of a sine wave having a period M/K for one sampling period, on a one-to-one basis, each of the M polyphase filters having  $N=L/M$  coefficients (where L and M are both positive integers) determined by dividing L coefficients by M." The Examiner further states that the recitations "L" and "M signals" fail to be clearly defined. It is believed that the Examiner is incorrect, as throughout the specification and claims (e.g., Page 3, Bottom; Page 5, Bottom; Page 6, Top), the recitations L and M are defined as positive integers. Moreover, L and M can be any

arbitrary positive integer. For example, if M is set to 10, the expression M signals would be equivalent to 10 signals. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §112 second paragraph.

Regarding the Examiner's rejection of Claim 2, the Examiner states that the elements of Claim 2 fail to relate to the elements of Claim 1. Claim 2 has been amended to further clarify the claim and place the claim into independent form so as to overcome the Examiner's rejection of Claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §112 second paragraph. It is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §112 second paragraph.

Regarding the Examiner's rejection of Claims 3 and 4, the Examiner states that the "wherein" phrases of Claims 3 and 4 recitations of function without the recitation of structure that is necessary to perform the function. Claims 3 and 4 have been amended to further clarify the claims and place Claims 3 and 4 into independent form so as to overcome the Examiner's rejection of Claims 3 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. §112 second paragraph. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claims 3 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. §112 second paragraph.

Regarding the Examiner's rejection of Claim 5, the Examiner states that Claim 5 contains deficiencies similar to Claim 1 and that the meaning of the phrase "dividing M codes by M" is indefinite. Claim 5 has been amended to further clarify the claim so as to

overcome the Examiner's rejection of Claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §112 second paragraph. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §112 second paragraph.

Regarding the Examiner's rejection of Claim 6, the Examiner states that Claim 6 contains deficiencies similar to Claim 1 and that the phrase "the polyphase filter" lacks clear antecedent basis and that the meaning of the phrase "a coefficient bank for switching one bank..." is unclear. Accordingly, Claim 6 has been amended to further clarify the claim so as to overcome the Examiner's rejection of Claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §112 second paragraph. Accordingly it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §112 second paragraph.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-6, as amended, overcome the stated rejections. Accordingly, Claims 1-6 are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact

Applicants' attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell  
Reg. No. 33,494  
Attorney for Applicant

**DILWORTH & BARRESE, LLP**

333 Earle Ovington Blvd.  
Uniondale, New York 11553  
Tel: (516) 228-8484  
Fax: (516) 228-8516

PJF/VAG/ml